

Remarks**Claim Rejections 35 USC § 112**

Claim 3 has been amended to address the Examiner's rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 101

Claim 17 has been amended to specify that the computer program is stored on a computer readable medium in order to address the Examiner's rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15-17 as being anticipated by US 6,678,720 Matsumoto. This is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Matsumoto does not describe a messaging system arranged to allow a user to send a pre-specified message to a destination party mail box. Rather Matsumoto is concerned with a chat system and the problem of allowing communication with a chat system from terminals that do not support chat (such as a conventional telephone). Matsumoto does not mention destination party mail boxes.

In contrast the present invention teaches a mechanism whereby the user can store a selection of pre-programmed messages that can be sent either without having to make a normal call, or by appending to a new voicemail or other message. This reduces the repetitive tasks associated with using voicemail and other media types of mail by having a selection of pre-recorded messages that can be quickly used.

The focus of Matsumoto is completely different. It is solving the problem of trying to enable real time communication between a chat system and other media type devices.

The Examiner states that Matsumoto describes at column 10 lines 66 to column 11 line 7 a messaging server arranged to store one or more pre-specified messages. Studying that passage of Matsumoto indicates that the Examiner reads the chat messaging device 1 of Matsumoto onto the messaging server of claim 1 and the pre-recorded voice prompt of Matsumoto onto the pre-specified messages of the present claims. This pre-recorded voice prompt of Matsumoto is used to prompt a user to make the following selection, "Do you want to leave a message for chat users or do you want to listen to a chat conversation?". Supposing that this argument is accepted (which it is not) then it is inconsistent with the rest of the Examiner's reading of claim 1.

In the system of Matsumoto a non-chat terminal such as a telephone sends, to a chat client or chat server, a voice, image or text message and an indication of a chat channel. It is desired to enable the members of the chat channel to access the message even though it is sent from a non-chat terminal. The chat client or server stores the non-chat message at a web page location that it specifies. It then notifies, using chat, the chat system of the address of the web page location where the message is stored. Chat users who receive the notice then use a web browser to access the stored message.

The passage at column 10 line 66 to column 11 line 7 cited by the Examiner describes the chat messaging device 1 using its telephone interface 11 to make a request to the non-chat access device 2. This is done by sending the pre-recorded voice prompt mentioned above.

The Examiner also states that Matsumoto teaches at column 12 lines 39-50 "a destination party mail box, wherein when a specified user input is received at the input, one of the pre-specified messages is sent to the destination party mail box from the messaging server". However this is not the case. The Examiner has already read the voice prompt pre-recorded at chat messaging device 1 onto the pre-specified messages of the claim. However, the passage at column 12 lines

39-50 does not mention the pre-recorded voice prompts. That passage of Matsumoto describes sending a URL of the web-page where the non-chat message is stored to a chat channel. These URLs are not pre-specified messages because they must vary according to in which web-page the non-chat message is stored. In addition the URLs are addresses at locations where messages are stored and are not messages themselves. Also the chat channel is not a destination party mail box. Therefore Matsumoto does not teach the claimed feature (ii) of claim 1. This feature is also found in the other independent claims 11, 15, 16 and 17 which are therefore also patentable over Matsumoto.

The dependent claims are also patentable over Matsumoto at least by virtue of their dependency. The detailed rejections of the dependent claims are therefore not accepted.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103


The Examiner rejects several of the dependent claims as well as independent claims 18 and 19 as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Baxter US 6,385,306. This is respectfully rejected for the following reasons.

Independent claims 18 and 19 are concerned with the embodiments of the present invention in which pre-specified messages are appended to a new voicemail (or other media type) message. Matsumoto gives no hint or direction to append messages in this way. Thus starting from Matsumoto the skilled person would have had no reason to look to Baxter. The Examiner states that the skilled person would have been motivated to consider Baxter because it teaches the advantage of transmitting digital audio file attachments to an email address without the need to set up an account. However, this argument is based on pure hindsight. Starting from Matsumoto the skilled person has no reason to even consider email messages or making audio attachments to them because Matsumoto is concerned with chat systems. Thus claims 18 and 19 are both patentable over Matsumoto in view of Baxter.

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2004



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg LLP
PO Box 2786
Chicago IL 60690-2786
(312) 357-1313 Telephone
(312) 759-5646 Facsimile
(312) 214-4811 Direct